



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,843	12/13/2001	Raj Bridgelall	1182	3827
29906	7590	01/25/2006		
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C. 7150 E. CAMELBACK, STE. 325 SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251			EXAMINER LE, UYEN CHAU N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,843

Applicant(s)

BRIDGELALL, RAJ

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 14-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/06/2004.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

Prelim. Amdt/Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 30 November 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al (US 5,280,159) in view of McAllister et al (US 6517000 B1).

Re claims 1-9 and 14-19: Schultz et al discloses an RF tag reader 10, which serves as a RFID extension for a mobile computer 30 lacking RFID functionality, comprising a battery 15 (fig. 5; col. 2, lines 64+); circuitry coupled to the battery 15 for providing the RFID functionality (col. 2, line 68 through col. 3, line 13); a first modular attachment interface 24

Art Unit: 2876

selectively coupling to a second modular attachment interface 24 of the mobile computer 30 to the circuitry/reader 10 such that the mobile computer 30 has access to the RFID functionality provided by the circuitry/reader 10 when the mobile computer 30 is coupled to the modular attachment interface 24 (fig. 10; col. 3, lines 14-48 and col. 4, lines 3-16); a barcode scanner 40 coupled to the second modular attachment interface 44 such that the mobile computer 30 has access to data encoded in a barcode symbol scanned by the barcode scanner 40 when the mobile computer 30 is coupled to the modular interface 44 (fig. 10; col. 3, lines 14-48 and col. 4, lines 3-16); wherein the circuitry for providing the RFID functionality further comprises an electromagnetic transceiver (col. 3, lines 1-14 and lines 35-40); wherein the circuitry for providing the RFID functionality further comprises a RFID tag air interface decoder (i.e., encoded data from transponder 21 received by an antenna 18 via an air interface) (col. 3, line 42-48); a wired network; an access point for transmitting transmission data from the wired network to the mobile computer 30 via a wireless medium and receiving reception data from the mobile computer 30 to the wired network via the wireless medium and also for forming a transmission area that includes space where association to the access point is possible by the mobile computer 30 (i.e., the

Art Unit: 2876

received data can be stored at the mobile computer 30, processed and transmitted wirelessly via antenna 33 to any desired access points) (col. 3, lines 45-48).

Schultz et al is silent with respect to the circuit including at least one of an electromagnetic transceiver and a RFID air interface decoder.

McAllister et al teaches an RFID system typically employs at least two components, a "transponder" or "tag," which is attached to the physical item to be identified, and a reader," which sends an electromagnetic signal to the transponder and then detects a response (*i.e., via an electromagnetic transceiver*). Typically, the reader emits a RF signal, which is received by the transponder, after the transponder comes within an appropriate range. In response, the transponder then sends its information via a modulated RF signal back to the reader. The reader detects this modulated signal, and can identify the transponder by decoding the modulated signal (*i.e., via a decoder which serves as an air decoder*). After identifying the transponder, the reader can either store the decoded information or transmit the decoded signal to a computer (col. 2, lines 14-46).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate

Art Unit: 2876

electromagnetic transceiver and a RFID air interface decoder of McAllister et al into the system of Schultz et al in order to provide Schultz et al with the ability to decode the received signal instantaneously within the tag reader, which can provide a real-time reading result system.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 30 November 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (p. 6, last paragraph through p. 8, 2nd paragraph), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

6. In response to the Applicant's argument to Schultz in view of McAllister does not disclose, teach, or suggest one of an electromagnetic receiver and a RFID air interface decoder (p. 8, last paragraph), the Examiner respectfully submits that "at least one of" means that it can be both electromagnetic receiver and RFID air interface decoder, but either one electromagnetic receiver or RFID air interface decoder can also be read into the

Art Unit: 2876

claim. In this case, the primary reference to Schultz et al discloses an RF tag reader 10, which serves as a RFID extension for a mobile computer 30 lacking RFID functionality, comprising a battery 15 (fig. 5; col. 2, lines 64+); circuitry coupled to the battery 15 for providing the RFID functionality (col. 2, line 68 through col. 3, line 13). Schultz however is silent with respect to an electromagnetic receiver or a RFID air interface decoder. The secondary reference to McAllister teaches an EAS antenna 522 can transmit an electromagnetic signal, and can detect a response signal sent back by the RFID tag 3 (col. 7, lines 32+), thus the EAS antenna 522 serves as an electromagnetic receiver. Accordingly, the claimed limitation, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, Schultz in view of McAllister meets the claimed invention (see the rejection above).

For the reasons stated above, the Examiner believes that a proper prima-facie case of obviousness has been established. Therefore, the Examiner has made this Office Action final.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2876

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-2397. The examiner can normally be reached on First Monday 5:30AM-1:30PM and Tues-Fri 5:30AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 571-272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2876

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Uyen-Chau N. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2876

January 18, 2006